

6-1976

The Impact of Boys' Club Membership and Participation Upon Self-Reported Delinquent Behavior

Charles Vaught

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>



Part of the [Civic and Community Engagement Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Vaught, Charles, "The Impact of Boys' Club Membership and Participation Upon Self-Reported Delinquent Behavior" (1976). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 1833.
<http://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/1833>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

THE IMPACT OF BOYS' CLUB MEMBERSHIP
AND PARTICIPATION UPON SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Sociology

Western Kentucky University

Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Sociology

by

Charles Vaught

June 1976

THE IMPACT OF BOYS' CLUB MEMBERSHIP
AND PARTICIPATION UPON SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

APPROVED 3-17-76 :
(Date)

Lorin M. Beck
Director of Thesis

W. Kirk Hansen

Craig H. Taylor

Charles Gray
Dean of the Graduate School

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	iii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Chapter	
I. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	7
II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND PREDICTIONS.....	22
III. METHOD.....	35
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	47
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	82
APPENDIX.....	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Delinquency Category After Joining Boys' Club, by Age Grouping.....	51
2. Delinquency Category of Respondents Before and After Joining Boys' Club.....	52
3. Delinquency Categories For Boys Aged 10-12.....	54
4. Delinquency Categories For Boys Aged 13-15.....	55
5. Delinquency Categories For Boys Aged 16-18.....	56
6. Delinquency Category After Joining The Boys' Club, by Friendship.....	58
7. Friendship Within The Club (Prior Score of 1)...	59
8. Friendship Within The Club (Prior Score of 2)...	60
9. Friendship Within The Club (Prior Score of 3)...	61
10. Length of Membership by Delinquency Category....	63
11. Activities Engaged in by Delinquency Category...	64
12. Average Weekly Attendance by Delinquency Category.....	66

THE IMPACT OF BOYS' CLUB MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION UPON
SELF-REPORTED DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR

Charles H. Vaught

March 1976

110 pages

Directed by: Louis M. Beck, H. Kirk Dansereau, and C. Taylor

Department of Sociology

Western Kentucky University

This study empirically tested the responses of sixty-one Boys' Club members to a questionnaire which contained the Nye-Short delinquency scale. Frequency of self-reported delinquent behavior was compared for the youngsters both before and after having joined the Boys' Club. It was found that the various aspects of Club membership and participation had minimal effect upon the members' delinquent behavior.

INTRODUCTION

From the earliest history of this country there has been public concern about the voluntary and undirected association of juveniles. The term juvenile delinquency had become a part of the popular literature by 1821, when citizens' committees were formed in Philadelphia for the purpose of devising means to combat what was considered an alarming increase in youthful crime.¹

Early explanations of juvenile misconduct attributed the increase in delinquent acts to random group activities, especially among the impoverished residents of the cities. Theses by law enforcement officials, the clergy, and members of the judiciary related the illegitimate pursuits of these lower class youngsters to various consequences of industrialization. Factors such as the breakdown of family controls, inadequate housing, unsupervised patronage of commercial recreational facilities, and undesirable asso-

¹Juvenile Offenders For A Thousand Years, ed. Wiley B. Sanders (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1970), p. 331.

ciations were frequently cited as causes of delinquency.

As the process of mechanization gained momentum evangelical forces began to search for ways to meet the needs of working boys in changing industrial conditions. Practical development of the boys' club idea grew out of these attempts to provide constructive leisure time pursuits. The first boys' club was established at Hartford, Connecticut in 1860.

After the Civil War boys' clubs multiplied rapidly, given impetus by energetic preachers who endowed the clubs with increasing importance as the religious and educational functions were separated from the family. The early clubs were adjuncts of individual churches and staffed by volunteers who frequently viewed the club situation as an extension of the Sunday School. Emphasis was placed upon the development of moral character through physical activity interjected with sermonettes derived from the protestant ethic.

In 1906 the American Boys' Club Federation was founded for the purpose of coordinating the activities of various clubs throughout the United States. Programs were standardized and an organizational philosophy was articulated. In 1931 the Federation was chartered by Congress as Boys'

Clubs of America. Today there are some 900 Boys' Clubs operating in this country, providing services for an estimated 900,000 boys.²

Boys' Clubs of America maintains central offices in New York City. Organized on a line-staff basis, the national organization has a chairman of the board, a president, and a national director. Regional supervisors maintain contact with Boys' Clubs in their regions, and aid in coordination of interclub activities, special events, and evaluation and introduction of programs.

The local Boys' Club is supervised by a board of directors composed of members of the community. The overall operation of the Boys' Club is the responsibility of the executive director. He is certified by the national organization, but receives his salary through the local board. The program director is also certified by the national organization, and is responsible for the internal functions of the Boys' Club. Subordinate to the program director are various staff members whose primary tasks revolve around the implementation of programs and activities.³ Financing

²Encyclopedia of Associations, ed. Margaret Fisk (Detroit: Gale Research Company Book Tower, 1970), vol. I, p. 607.

³Internal organization will vary somewhat from Boys'

for the local Boys' Club is obtained through community fund drives and private contributions.

The Boys' Club philosophy is articulated in the stated purpose of the Boys' Club: "to promote the health, social, educational, vocational, and character development of boys."⁴ Boys' Clubs are urban oriented, focussing their programs primarily in the high delinquency areas of the inner city. Boys' Club programs are aimed at countering what is considered the socially undesirable milieu of the city streets.

Programs outlined by the national organization fall into several major categories: citizenship education, organized small groups, arts and crafts, cultural programs, games room activities, guidance, health program, physical program, and special events.⁵ Local Boys' Clubs will offer most, or all of these activities with varying degrees of effectiveness.

Recruitment into the Boys' Club is based upon the appeal to specific interests and the attraction of equipment

Club to Boys' Club, but will generally follow the specifications advanced by the national organization. Certification is obtained by the completion of a specialized course of instruction offered by New York University.

⁴Encyclopedia of Associations, op. cit., p. 607.

⁵Program Evaluation in a Boys' Club (New York: Boys' Clubs of America, 1967), p. 2.

and building. The interest thus stimulated is utilized in the attempt to develop specific behavior patterns whose aims are expressed in broad generalizations such as "good citizenship", "character building", etc.

The Boys' Club is a social welfare agency which utilizes the group work approach in dealing with its clients. The assumption underlying group work is that conditions in certain families and neighborhoods are such that there is a loss of social control. This situation may be compensated for by the conscious organization of small groups about some specific interest. In the varied activities of group interaction there are potentials for the development of stable and accepted patterns of behavior. Deviations within the group are defined in terms of the norms of the dominant culture.

One of the underlying assumptions of the Boys' Club philosophy is that Boys' Clubs aid in the prevention of juvenile delinquency. Research conducted in the past has yielded contradictory findings regarding the effectiveness of Boys' Clubs as agents of delinquency prevention. This study will concede that Boys' Clubs provide socially desirable services to disadvantaged juvenile boys,⁶ and will deal

⁶Frederic M. Thrasher, "The Boys' Club and Juvenile

with the relationships between a Boys' Club and delinquent acts.

Delinquency," The American Journal of Sociology, vol. 42 (1936), p. 80.

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A review of the literature revealed four studies relating to the impact of a Boys' Club on juvenile delinquency. The first study, which yielded seven articles, was conducted by Frederic Thrasher.¹ The investigation covered a period of time from 1927 to 1931, and utilized descriptive, ecological, statistical, and case study approaches. Its purpose was to evaluate delinquency prevention by a Boys' Club which had been recently opened in a high crime area in New York City. The initial cost of the Boys' Club was \$735,000, and the annual operating budget was approximately \$75,000. It was expected that the Boys' Club would serve 6,000 boys. The following paragraphs discuss the results.

Membership in the Boys' Club was based upon three age divisions: Juniors from seven to thirteen, Intermediates from thirteen to eighteen, and the Seniors who were eighteen or older. The Intermediate program focussed upon small group clubs which were led by volunteer workers. The Senior

¹Frederic M. Thrasher, "The Boys' Club Study," Journal of Educational Sociology, vol. 6 (Sept. 1932), pp. 4-16.

group clubs were organized and run by the members themselves. The Juniors were served by a general program which did not concentrate so heavily upon small groups. Club activities included games, physical education classes, parties and special events, a lunchroom, and motion pictures.

The case study aspects of the Boys' Club Study were conducted by Robert L. Whitley.² His study population consisted of sixty boys who had at some time previously been defined as problems by the school, or as delinquent by the courts. All the boys studied lived in an area served by one Boys' Club unit. Their ages ranged from twelve to seventeen years. The acts for which they were adjudged "problem" or "delinquent" varied in seriousness from disobedience to robbery.

The boys were observed in several types of situations including the family group, the classroom, and the Boys' Club. Each boy was given a physical checkup and an intelligence test. Many were given aptitude tests, and a few received psychiatric interviews.

Interviews with the boys regarding their background and social experiences were guided by interview schedules de-

²Robert L. Whitley, "Case Studies in the Boys' Club Study," Journal of Educational Sociology, vol. 6 (Sept. 1932), pp. 17-30.

vised by the author. Observations were guided by a checklist, and the records of behavior were written down immediately after the observation. An effort was made to insure that the boys were as comparable as possible. The method employed by the author attempted to determine: whether the boys' interests centered in the Boys' Club, or in activities outside the Boys' Club; whether a group with which the boy identified participated in the Boys' Club program; and the extent to which the boy's behavior patterns remained the same although he participated in the program.

In the discussion of his research, Whitley argued that the influence of the Boys' Club may be observed by the manner in which the boy integrates it into his total life organization, and by the way in which the values represented by the Boys' Club are reflected in the attitudes and behavior of the individual. The Boys' Club has a definite policy to implement, and a definite method for putting the policy into operation. The effectiveness of the organization is measured by the extent to which its staff and program are able to impart the valued patterns of behavior to its participants.

The boy brings to the Boys' Club certain mental and physical attributes, and a certain social background. He

also has status in various groups, within which he plays a more or less satisfactory role. The extent to which he becomes a participant in the activities of the Boys' Club will be determined by the extent to which he feels it is desirable to belong. If the Boys' Club does not make a strong appeal to the boy, it is not expected that it will modify his behavior to any great extent. The effectiveness of the Boys' Club also depends upon whether or not the boy wishes to achieve a particular status within the social situation of the Club. Whitley indicates that one difficulty in assessing the effectiveness of the Boys' Club is that the organization looks for its results in the intangible states of behavior and attitudes.

Janet Nelson was responsible for the statistical aspects of the Boys' Club Study.³ The first step of her research was the analysis of the area served by the Boys' Club. Truancy and delinquency rates were studied in terms of their incidence in the whole community, and in Boys' Club and non-Boys' Club groups. Basic census information was utilized in determining the nationality, family size, age, and occupations of individuals in each family unit in

³Janet Fowler Nelson, "The Statistical Aspects of the Boys' Club Study," Journal of Educational Sociology, vol. 6 (Sept. 1932), pp. 31-42.

the area. The study was based on the records of 6,744 families and of 4,440 boys between the ages of six and sixteen.

Through the use of the census data an attempt was made to detect possible differences between families of Boys' Club members, previous members, and eligible but non-Club members. An attempt was also made to ascertain differences between truants and delinquents classified as members and non-members.

A comparison was made between delinquents and non-delinquents, some of whom were Boys' Club members and some who were non-members. Age, nationality, and social status were statistically controlled. The data were analyzed in terms of distribution, central tendency, and variation of test scores.

The Hollerith system was utilized to classify and correlate data of all members of the Boys' Club unit for three and one-half years. The membership of each boy was examined in relation to Boys' Club activities, age, nationality, social status, and the problems of truancy and delinquency. Thirty-five items were punched including the number of activities a boy participated in, his leadership position, the number of delinquency charges against him, and his current membership status.

The Boys' Club Study used the ecological approach in delineating and describing the areas served by a particular Boys' Club unit.⁴ A social base map was prepared by outlining the blocks served by the Club unit. Factors affecting mobility and isolation, such as transportation facilities and physical barriers, were included. Institutional facilities and land usage were considered important as background for other data. Also included were background data concerning types of housing, population density, and nationalities.

A problem crucial to the evaluation of a Boys' Club and its influence on juvenile delinquency is that of membership turnover.⁵ One phase of the Boys' Club Study was to determine factors outside and inside the Boys' Club which influenced the membership status of the boys. A group of 1,000 boys were interviewed by specially trained boys' workers. Through seemingly casual conversation the worker attempted to compose a description of the character and activities of the primary group of which the boy was a mem-

⁴Frederic M. Thrasher, "Ecological Aspects of the Boys' Club Study," Journal of Educational Sociology, vol. 6 (Sept. 1932), pp. 52-58.

⁵Zola Braunstein, "Boys' Club Membership Mortality and Turnover," Journal of Educational Sociology, vol. 6 (Sept. 1932), pp. 59-63.

ber. Efforts were made to ascertain the reasons the individual left the Boys' Club as well as the current membership status of the group with which he had been affiliated. It was found that there was a considerable variation of group behavior within a particular Boys' Club unit. Some groups would manifest a continuous history through several years only to disband abruptly. Certain groups were formed which were homogeneous in characteristics. These groups would be joined to other groups displaying many of the same characteristics, but differing in degree. The result would be a definite type of behavior by one or the other groups after a short period of time. The failure of these groups to accommodate each other remained unexplained. Other groups would be seen to develop reputations centering about one particular type of behavior or activity such as athletics, superior mentality, or delinquent behavior. The turnover rate was found to be rather high. The turnover rate for volunteer workers was almost as high as for the Boys' Club membership.

The overall conclusion of the Boys' Club Study was that the Boys' Club was not a significant factor in the prevention of juvenile delinquency.⁶ It was determined that the

⁶Frederic M. Thrasher, "The Boys' Club and Juvenile Delinquency," The American Journal of Sociology, vol. 42 (1936), pp. 66-80.

Boys' Club failed to reach the projected book membership of 6,000 boys. The actual capacity of the Boys' Club was approximately 4,000. It was further established that the Boys' Club was not able to achieve more than 63% of its capacity of 4,000 during any month for which records were available. Furthermore, there were an estimated 4,000 boys in the area served by the Boys' Club who were never enrolled in the Boys' Club program during the four years of the Study.

A survey of the Juniors revealed that the bulk of the Junior members did not display any regular or consistent participation in Boys' Club activities, and that membership was no more than nominal for many of the boys enrolled in the Junior program.

The Intermediates showed a large discrepancy between book enrollment and actual month to month registration. There were also large numbers of Intermediates who failed to achieve the required 70% attendance in business meetings and physical education periods. Many Intermediate group clubs disbanded during the course of a year, or were not renewed the following year. The Senior program had a remarkably unsuccessful history during the two years of its existence.

The Boys' Club proved least effective during the summer months. Only 13% of the boys enrolled participated in the camping program, while general Boys' Club activities were severely curtailed.

Approximately one-third of the boys who were enrolled each year quit after one year. A small percentage of individuals remained members over an extended period of time. Most members were lost because of factors over which it was felt the Boys' Club had some control.

Delinquency rates were higher for the Boys' Club than for the community in general, but the Boys' Club was drawing a disproportionate number of boys who were considered by the author to be "socially inferior" and prone to delinquency. However, the Boys' Club had little or no influence in decreasing the number of offenses committed by its own members. It was found that 18% of the offenses of members occurred before membership, 28% occurred after the termination of a membership period, and 61% occurred during the time of active membership. The delinquency-truancy rate for boys who maintained a three year membership went from 5.12 for the first year to 3.56 for the second year, and then to 6.00 for the third year. The rates then dropped to 3.56 for the fourth year, when the boys were no longer members.

In 1942 Ellery Reed conducted a study which is incidentally related to Boys' Clubs.⁷ He examined records of fifty youths drawn from the files of the Cincinnati Juvenile Court. Only fourteen cases had been registered with any group work agency during any part of the three year period prior to their court appearance.

The author hypothesized that the agencies served children who were less likely to become delinquent. To test this hypothesis he made a random selection of 1,679 boys and girls who were members of group work agencies, and a control group of 246 who had come before the juvenile court. The two groups were then compared.

It was found that a smaller proportion of group work children came from the poorest areas, and that the court children lived in the most unstable homes. Group work agencies served a younger age distribution than was found in the control group.

It was observed that group work children grew more delinquent as they matured. The delinquency rate was 31.0 for the agency group compared to 20.0 for the control group. However, the rate of serious offenses was only 16.0 for the

⁷Ellery F. Reed, "How Effective Are Group-Work Agencies in Preventing Delinquency?" The Social Service Review, vol. 22 (1948), pp. 340-348.

agency group compared to 30.5 for the control group.

Roscoe Brown and Dan Dodson attempted to assess the impact of a Louisville Boys' Club on the official delinquency rates of the area it served.⁸ The Club was selected by the national staff of Boys' Clubs of America because it was recently established, operated in a poor area, the delinquency rate of the area was high at the time of the Club's inception, and it was the only major youth agency in the area.

Data on delinquency rates for a two year period prior to the establishment of the Club were obtained in order to provide a base line. With the aid of the Assistant Chief of Police, "who was a leader in the Boys' Club movement in Louisville,"⁹ access was gained to the records of the Crime Prevention Bureau. Delinquency rates were then based upon the number of boys who committed delinquent acts during the course of a year compared to the number of boys living in the area.

The authors then selected two control areas which were considered to differ from the Club area chiefly in that they

⁸Roscoe Brown and Dan Dodson, "The Effectiveness of a Boys' Club in Reducing Delinquency," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, no. 322 (Mar. 1959), pp. 47-52.

⁹Ibid., p. 49.

did not have a major youth serving agency. The areas were similar in levels of median income, median rental, and median education. However, they were dissimilar in the number of population and per cent non-white residents.

The findings of the study showed that for the experimental group there was a decrease in the official delinquency rate from 5.3% in 1946 to 2.6% in 1954, while the rate for the city as a whole increased from 3.4% in 1946 to 5.5% in 1954. The rates for the control areas also increased. The rate in one area increased from 2.3% in 1946 to 6.0% in 1954. The increase in the other control area was from 3.6% to 4.7% for the same period.

In discussing their findings the authors stated that there were other factors in the area which might have led to a decrease in delinquency. At the time when there was a presence of social processes which led to the establishment of the Boys' Club, there were forces which were contributing to the instability of the two control areas. The authors concluded that perhaps what is needed in determining the role of a Boys' Club in preventing delinquency is a study of community processes combined with case studies of large numbers of delinquent and non-delinquent boys.

It should be noted that while the Boys' Club in the preceding study seems to have decreased juvenile delinquency, the researchers were relying wholly upon official delinquency

statistics. There is no discussion by the authors as to the possible consequences resulting from having an Assistant Chief of Police who was a proponent of Boys' Clubs. It is possible, however, that this situation affected police policy in the Boys' Club area. As a result of a variation in policy, official delinquency rates would be affected.

The fourth study was conducted under the auspices of the Ford Foundation. The Foundation seems to have summed up the attitude of the general public, and of many researchers, in a report written after a canvass of Chicago's West Side. In discussing the Henry Horner Boys' Club the author states: "...the Club has made the streets of the West Side in Chicago safe to walk where gang violence once was rife."¹⁰

The problem of the present research is derived from the fact that preceding studies have relied in part or entirely upon official delinquency rates in attempting to obtain an assessment of delinquent activities in a particular area. With the exception of Thrasher and associates, there have been no attempts to determine relationships between various aspects of Boys' Club membership participation and commission of delinquent acts. The other studies undertaken

¹⁰Ford Foundation, The Society of the Streets, A Report Prepared by the Ford Foundation (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1962), p. 10.

have simply been surveys of delinquency rates before and after the introduction of a Club into a specific area in order to get some estimate of operational effectiveness of Boys' Club programs.

In the past decade some researchers, dissatisfied with seeming inadequacies of official delinquency statistics, have attempted to develop techniques which would allow them to directly question youngsters about their delinquent activities. Investigators have felt that this approach enabled them to go beyond the "delinquent"- "non-delinquent" dichotomy established by the judiciary and explore the "hidden areas" of the delinquency problem. Although this approach has been widely utilized in the past few years, there has been no attempt to apply self-report techniques within the Boys' Club context.

The twofold task which the present research attempts to accomplish, therefore, is significant in that: (1) it is the first research to question the reliability of official statistics in an area containing a well known youth-serving agency such as the Boys' Club, and thus utilizes a technique for exploring the "hidden areas" of delinquent activity among the Boys' Club membership; and (2) it looks beyond the popular assumption that mere "Club membership" con-

strains a youngster toward the commission of fewer delinquent acts, and attempts to ascertain if a pattern of relationships exists between various aspects of Boys' Club membership participation and admitted delinquent activity. It should be noted that the present research does not presuppose that the Boys' Club is in actuality a delinquency prevention mechanism.

The value of a study which investigates relationships between membership participation and admitted delinquent activity may be illustrated as follows: with the increase of juvenile crime in this country more and more emphasis has been placed upon determining methods of prevention. Consequently, programs which allegedly play a part in community crime prevention projects assume growing importance to concerned members of the community, who lend both moral and monetary support.

Delinquency prevention programs are also of increasing interest to social scientists, many of whom are concerned with discovering the etiology of delinquency. By evaluating the approach and effectiveness of various agencies such as the Boys' Club and discovering what "works" and what doesn't, the social scientist brings himself closer to an understanding of the phenomenon he is studying.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND PREDICTIONS

Most sociologists have centered their research concerning delinquency upon the assumption that there exists a system of beliefs ascribing positive values to delinquent activity, that this system of beliefs has arisen in the lower class as a means of compensating for relative inability to gain status and prestige through the usual channels open to the advantaged middle class, and that these beliefs are shared by a significant number of juveniles. Many writers view this delinquent subculture as being in opposition to the dominant culture: the values and beliefs of the dominant culture do not effectively penetrate the insular barrier of negativism and hostility inherent in the delinquent subculture. The members of the subculture are therefore socialized to adhere to expectations which are distinctly unlawful.

Although Frederic Thrasher did not talk about "delinquent subcultures", his material dealing with the gang nevertheless anticipated several subcultural types.¹ Thrasher

¹Frederic M. Thrasher, The Gang: A Study of 1,313 Gangs in Chicago (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927).

noted differences in types of gangs, and differentiated between "diffuse" and "solidified" groups, and "conventionalized" and "criminal" orientations.

For Thrasher, the gang was a lower class phenomenon which came into existence when the play group found itself in conflict with some element in the environment. As the gang developed it became increasingly competitive for the loyalty of the youngster. The ability of the gang to win the loyalty of the individual resulted largely from the weakness and ineffectiveness of the family unit and other institutional mechanisms with which the youngster came into contact.

Albert Cohen describes the delinquent subculture as "non-utilitarian," "malicious," and "negativistic," and being most effectively articulated within the context of the delinquent gang.² Although he considers the predominant delinquent activity of the gang to be stealing, Cohen stresses the versatility of the gang. He points out that stealing tends to be accompanied by other property offenses such as vandalism and trespass, as well as truancy and malicious mischief.

²Albert Cohen, Delinquent Boys (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955).

For Cohen, the delinquent subculture is a design for living which is not only in conflict with the dominant culture, but may be defined by its "negative polarity" to the rules of "respectable" society. The delinquent subculture, then, offers the individual a way of achieving status by taking the norms and goals of the larger culture and "turning them upside down."³

Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin differentiated three major types of delinquency subcultures; the criminal-oriented, the conflict-oriented, and the ~~recreatist~~recreatist-oriented.⁴ This "opportunity" theory of delinquency assumes that the development of a delinquent subculture depends not only upon blocked opportunity for legitimate status achievement, but also on the opportunity to learn delinquent roles. This learning requires an environment which not only contains models for crime and delinquency, but also provides the juvenile the opportunity to interact with these models in a situation which makes delinquency possible. Thus, the type delinquency subculture which develops is dependent upon the illegitimate opportunities that are available in a particular neighborhood.

³Ibid., p. 28.

⁴Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960).

A "hard-line" view of the delinquent subculture which postulates complete socialization into delinquent activities with the resultant rejection of the dominant culture makes it rather difficult to explain how gang members are "reformed" as they mature, or how so many hidden delinquents are able to function in society. It is for this reason, perhaps, that some writers have "softened" their theoretical formulations regarding delinquency subcultures.

Walter B. Miller contends that the motivation of the law violating behavior of lower class street corner groups might best be understood by examining the cultural forces impinging upon the individual as they are perceived from that individual's point of view, rather than from the point of view of middle class culture.⁵ In the case of gang delinquency the cultural system exerting the most influence upon the individual is the lower class community itself, rather than a "delinquent subculture" which has arisen through conflict with middle class culture and is oriented toward the deliberate violation of middle class norms.

The lower class community is characterized by certain "focal concerns" which clearly distinguish it from the mid-

⁵Walter B. Miller, "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," Journal of Social Issues, vol. 14, no. 3, 1958, pp. 5-19.

dle class community. For Miller, "Following cultural practices which comprise essential elements of the total life pattern of lower class culture automatically violates certain legal norms."⁶ It is from the ethos of the "lower class culture," therefore, rather than a "delinquent subculture," that Miller infers delinquent behavior.

More germane to this thesis is David Matza's concept of the "subculture of delinquency."⁷ For Matza the subculture of delinquency consists of codes of conduct and custom that are a synthesis of convention and crime. The subculture articulates objectives that may be attained through delinquency, but also by other means. The customs of the subculture of delinquency allow delinquent activity, and may even suggest it, but delinquency is neither demanded nor necessarily considered the preferred course. The norms and sentiments of the subculture are beliefs that function as the extenuating circumstances under which delinquency is permissible.

Matza considers that most delinquents are those who have "drifted" into delinquency. Drift stands between free-

⁶Walter B. Miller, "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," Journal of Social Issues, vol. 14, no. 3, 1958, p. 18.

⁷David Matza, Delinquency and Drift (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964), pp. 59-60.

dom and control. Its basis is that area of the social structure in which control has been loosened, coupled with the abortiveness of the adolescent endeavor to fashion a coherent, autonomous subculture, and hence an independent source of social control around illegal action. The delinquent, somewhat freed from the control of the larger society, but lacking the capacity for positive action in his own behalf, transiently exists in a limbo between convention and crime, responding to the demands of first one, then the other.

Juveniles who adhere to the subculture of delinquency are aware that there exist deviant alternatives and objectives, and utilize them on occasion. However, they are also conscious of expectations of conformity to the parent culture. It has been noted by other writers that even the most delinquent youngster spends a majority of his time engaged in non-delinquent activities.

The propensity to commit oneself to a deviant course of action in a particular situation is transmitted from the subculture to the individual through the peer group. The group inculcates the individual with a set of beliefs derived from the particular section of society from which the group originates. The content of this set of beliefs is determined to

an extent by the survival value placed upon certain courses of action by the group.

The peer group is composed of a number of individuals of approximately the same age who have become more or less integrated through interaction based on established patterns. This group constitutes a reference group for the individual who, either through membership or identification, holds the group in high esteem.

Robert Merton discusses two criteria of a group in addition to the above mentioned patterned interaction.⁸ Interacting persons have patterned expectations as to the forms interaction will take. These expectations are binding upon those who "belong" to the group. It is also necessary that the interacting persons be defined by others as belonging to the group. These others include both members and non-members. The form taken by the definition may be either explicit in the instance of formal groups, or implicit in the instance of informal groups.

The terms "member" and "non-member" do not denote a dichotomous situation. Merton notes that there appear to be degrees of membership based upon frequency and intensity of

⁸Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1964), p. 286.

interaction.⁹ The "integral" group member is one whose social interaction with other group members consumes a large proportion of his time, and who is most likely to define himself in terms of group expectations. The "peripheral" member is one whose social interaction with other group members consumes little of his time, and does not appreciably affect his behavior. The "nominal" group member is one who is defined by others as being engaged in group interaction but who has either never actually engaged in interaction with others of the group, or has discontinued doing so.

There also appear to be differing categories of non-members based upon eligibility for membership in the group, combined with attitudes toward joining. The person who aspires to join a particular group, and who is considered by the group to be eligible for membership may be motivated to select the group as his reference group prior to becoming an actual member. He may, through "anticipatory socialization," internalize the norms and values of the group to which he aspires, often with group approval.

The individual who is motivated to select as a reference a group whose members do not consider him eligible will be dissuaded from joining the group whose norms and values

⁹Ibid., p. 287.

he has internalized.¹⁰ At the same time he may be repulsed by the group of which he is currently a member because of his rejection of group norms and orientation toward an out-group. The result may be that he comes to view both these groups negatively.

In view of the above discussion, the individual who seems most likely to recognize and articulate the subculture of delinquency is one who is an "integral" member of a peer group which embraces the values and beliefs of the subculture. The individual who is a non-member, but who is positively oriented toward the group is also likely to articulate the subculture of delinquency. This individual may not, however, be as greatly influenced by the group as would an integral member.

The effectiveness with which the group transmits the values and beliefs of the subculture of delinquency will depend upon factors in addition to the orientation of its various members. The structure of the group has implications for the clarity with which expected forms of behavior are recognized and articulated by the membership. Unequivocal membership criteria serves to define the roles of the members while at the same time facilitating the implementa-

¹⁰Ibid., p. 291.

tion of social control processes aimed at securing conformity to group expectations.

The ability of the group to insinuate itself into the total life pattern of its members has a reciprocal relationship to the effectiveness of the group as an agent of cultural transmission.¹¹ The group which controls the sentiments of its members will constitute a primary reference group for those members in a majority of the roles they play. The values of the group will be more efficiently expressed by the membership than the values of a group which exerts little control upon the sentiments of its members.

Length of group membership may be significant both in terms of role expectations within the group and reference behavior outside the group. Internalization of expected patterns of behavior is an "interaction process" which necessitates dependency upon a time element.¹² Therefore, individuals who have been members of the group for a longer period of time are more likely to articulate the expected behavior of the group than are those members who have belonged to the group for only a short period of time.

¹¹R. L. Whitley, Op. Cit., p. 17.

¹²Howard S. Becker, Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance, (New York: The Free Press, 1963), Chap. 3.

The extent of social participation within the group has implications for the transmission of cultural expectations. Participation may be diverse in nature, necessitating interaction with occupants of a majority of statuses in the group, or it may be rather selective, bringing the actor in contact with only a few status occupants. Group norms will become visible to the actor to the degree that he is able to identify the statuses and role performances that comprise the group.¹³

In the instance of groups which contain distinctive sub-units a problem may arise in terms of differing orientations toward the alternatives which appear in normative patterns. In the Boys' Club the distinctive sub-units will consist of adult staff members whose primary task is to reflect the dominant value system and to interpret behavior in terms of valued normative patterns, and the various groupings of juveniles who may differ in normative commitment.

The further relevance of the preceding theoretical concepts to this study will be seen more clearly in the paragraphs below. The following are hypotheses developed from the above theory.

First, respondents who report committing few delinquent

¹³Merton, Op. Cit., p. 319.

acts before joining the Boys' Club will report an increase in delinquent activity after joining. This hypothesis takes into account Thrasher's finding that years of non-membership both before joining and after leaving the Boys' Club were generally characterized by lower delinquency rates than were the years of actual Club membership (see pages 10 and 11 above). The underlying assumption of this hypothesis is that the Boys' Club membership constitutes a peer group drawn from that segment of the social structure most characterized by the subculture of delinquency. Membership in this group, therefore, will expose the individual to reinforcement of the values, beliefs, and expectations manifest in delinquent behavior. It should be noted that group pressures may serve to modify an individual's existing behavior patterns oriented toward delinquency, possibly channeling the activities of the individual who is "too bad" in directions that are acceptable to the group.

Second, length of Boys' Club membership will have a positive relationship to frequency of reported delinquent acts. This hypothesis reflects the general view of Becker and Merton that internalization of role expectations and reference behavior requires a process of interaction which must be relatively long-term and stable.

Third, increased social participation in the Boys' Club will have a direct relationship to increased reported delinquent behavior for individuals who were previously less delinquent. It is expected that members who participate extensively in unorganized activities will interact with a large number of delinquents thereby internalizing informal expectations of the group without being exposed to the expectations of the dominant culture exemplified in the attitudes of the staff members. However, individuals who participate extensively in organized activities will be expected to give greater consideration to the normative expectations of the dominant culture.

Finally, there will be a positive relationship between age and frequency of reported acts, up to age sixteen. This hypothesis takes into account the generally accepted observation that delinquency tends to increase until the juvenile's sixteenth year and then gradually decreases thereafter.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The method and design of this research was structured in such a manner as to allow the use of a self-report instrument. The self-report technique involves the use of a questionnaire or interview schedule to question a sample of juveniles about their delinquent behavior. It seems pertinent at this point to briefly examine selected studies which have utilized self-report techniques in order to establish the validity of administering a self-report instrument to the sample population of this study.

One of the earlier attempts to assess the incidence of "hidden delinquency" was carried out by Murphy, Shirley, and Witmer in conjunction with the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study.¹ The Cambridge-Somerville project was a five year program of delinquency prevention directed toward boys living in high delinquency areas. The fact that case workers had intimate contact with the boys and their families over an extended period of time resulted in their obtaining con-

¹Fred J. Murphy, Mary M. Shirley, and Helen L. Witmer, "The Incidence of Hidden Delinquency," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, vol. 16 (1946), pp. 686-96.

siderable information about admitted offenses which had not become a matter of record.

The case workers were requested to record admitted offenses as "rarely", "occasionally", and "frequently" committed. Of a total of 114 boys who had been given service throughout the five year period, thirteen were not known to have committed an offense for which a complaint could be made. Of the remainder, forty were designated as official delinquents because a complaint had been registered in court, and sixty-one as unofficial delinquents because they had avoided court complaint.

The authors estimated a minimum number of 6,416 infractions had occurred during the five year period, while only ninety-five violations had become a matter of official complaint. Many of the boys, however, had been apprehended and warned by the police without an official complaint being lodged. Court complaints were registered most often for larceny and breaking and entering. The authors concluded that there is some evidence that official cases reflect the more serious offenses, and that violations committed by the official offenders were more frequent and more serious than the violations committed by the unofficial group.

In 1955 Nye and Short applied the Guttman scaling

technique to their study of self-reported delinquent behavior.² The authors constructed scales based on three samples: a sample of the public high school students in three adjacent cities in a far western state; the state training school for boys and girls in this state; and the public high school students in one rural district, a rural-urban fringe district, and a suburban town in a midwestern state. The total sample consisted of 2,947 high school students, and 596 training school students.

Data were obtained from the sample by means of a questionnaire consisting of certain background items pertaining to socioeconomic status and a twenty-three item checklist covering a wide range of offenses. Within this checklist the authors discovered a seven item, a nine item, and an eleven item scale. Employing the Cornell technique the authors obtained a coefficient of reproducibility of .78. This was improved to .97 by employing the Israel Gamma image analysis.

In a further application of their research the authors concluded that there is no significant difference in delin-

²F. Ivan Nye and James F. Short, Jr., "Scaling Delinquent Behavior," American Sociological Review, vol. 22 (June, 1957), pp. 326-31.

quent behavior for differing socioeconomic statuses.³ In a retest of that finding Ronald L. Akers administered Nye-Short delinquency scale items to 992 junior high students in a large northeastern Ohio city during the spring of 1961.⁴ A series of significance tests substantiated the conclusions of Nye and Short.

As an extension of the work done by Nye and Short, Dentler and Monroe administered a fourteen item questionnaire to all seventh and eighth grade students in junior high schools in three Kansas communities.⁵ The schools were chosen because of their demographic differences. Six hundred forty-four respondents resided in or near a middle class suburb, 111 in a rural farm town, and 157 in a rural non-farm community. Five items related to stealing behavior were chosen for scaling. The authors were able to obtain an overall coefficient of reproducibility of .97 for the three groups.

³F. Ivan Nye, James F. Short, and Virgil J. Olsen, "Socioeconomic Status and Delinquent Behavior," The American Journal of Sociology, vol. 63 (June, 1958), pp. 381-88.

⁴Ronald L. Akers, "Socioeconomic Status and Delinquent Behavior: A Retest," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, vol. 1 (Jan., 1964), pp. 38-46.

⁵Robert A. Dentler and Lawrence J. Monroe, "Social Correlates of Early Adolescent Theft," American Sociological Review, vol. 26 (Oct., 1961), pp. 733-43.

Of eleven demographic factors investigated, the authors found significant association with the theft scale on only three; sex, age, and order of birth. Like Nye and Short, the authors found no significant relationship between socioeconomic status and delinquent behavior.

Dentler and Monroe also developed four Guttman scales from the responses of 610 of the junior high youngsters in an effort to explore association between three dimensions of family life and patterns of social conduct.⁶ The three scales concerning family dimensions were not intercorrelated. There was no significant relationship between either the Life-Chance or the Interpersonal Relations scale and the Conduct scale. However, the Home Centered Activities scale was found to be significantly related to the Conduct scale.

As has been indicated by the above discussion, the self-report technique has been utilized more or less successfully on differential juvenile samples. The fact that scales were determined within the instruments allowed for measurement and further qualification of the data obtained.

Basically, the design of the present research was structured in such a way as to indicate any significant

⁶Robert A. Dentler and Lawrence J. Monroe, "The Family and Early Adolescent Conformity and Deviance," Marriage and Family Living, vol. 23 (Aug. 1961), pp. 241-47.

differences between the amount of delinquent activity youngsters reported engaging in prior to joining the Boy's Club and the amount they admitted engaging in subsequent to joining. The nature of the problem presented the research with the necessity of developing an instrument (see appendix) which would adequately answer questions posed in the statement of the problem. The instrument utilized a previously constructed scale to measure and qualify the data to be obtained.

It was necessary to include in the first section of the instrument such items as would allow for the determination of each respondent's age, length of Boy's Club membership, average weekly attendance, types of Boy's Club activities normally engaged in, and the estimated proportion of friends who were Boy's Club members. This allowed the researcher to group the respondents in such a way as to control variables.

The second section of the instrument consisted of a checklist of twenty-two items of the Nye-Short delinquency scale.⁷ The respondent was requested to indicate those acts he had engaged in prior to joining the Boys' Club. The responses to each item were coded to indicate frequency

⁷The item "Had sex relations with person of same sex" was omitted at the request of the Boys' Club staff.

of violation.

The third section of the instrument repeated the questions posed in the second section. However, in this section, the respondent was requested to indicate those acts he had engaged in after joining the Boys' Club.

The final section of the instrument consisted of seven items which attempted to ascertain certain factors in the respondent's domestic background. The parental condition was considered worthy of at least brief scrutiny in light of the fact that parents usually have some impact on the lives of their children; even those who are members of the subculture of delinquency.

The first five questions were broken into logical categories and coded for ease in manipulation (see appendix). Responses to each of the scale items in the instrument were coded as follows: No-1; Once or twice-2; Several times-3; Very often-4.⁸

In addition, following the Nye-Short guideline, the scaleable items were assigned numerical scores: zero for a no response, one for once or twice, and two for several

⁸The Nye-Short scale items are: "Driven a car without driver's license." "Skipped school without an excuse." "Defied parent's authority to their faces." "Taken things of less than \$2 value." "Damaged or destroyed property." "Bought or drank wine, beer, or liquor." "Had sex relations with person of opposite sex."

times or very often. Therefore, it was possible for the respondent to obtain a minimum score of zero on the scale items, and a maximum score of fourteen.

Statistical manipulation subsequent to gathering the data indicated that intervals could be established and the scores weighted as follows: A score of zero (0) or one (1) was given the weight one (1); a score of two to four (2-4) was given the weight two (2); a score of five to fourteen (5-14) was given the weight three (3). The use of denominate integers as weights allowed the quantification of categories on the delinquency score continuum. Scores given the weight (1) were considered low; scores given the weight (2) were considered intermediate; and scores given the weight (3) were considered high.

The seven items at the end of the instrument, which attempted to ascertain certain factors concerning the respondent's domestic background were also broken into categories and coded. Since the responses were forced-answer responses an attempt was made to allow for all possible situations within certain (admittedly) broad limits.

The population to be sampled ranged in age from ten to eighteen, and was predominately lower-class black. Therefore, certain semantic problems were assumed to be inherent

in the questionnaire approach due to the disparity between the language of the questionnaire and the language customarily spoken by the members of the sample population. The problem was expected to be especially acute among the younger respondents, who would be in the lower elementary school grades, and whose reading proficiency might not be expected to be high. At the same time, the direct interview approach was considered less than desirable due to the anticipated tendency of the respondent to "lie good" or "lie bad" in an attempt to impress the interviewer. It was therefore decided to use the "directed questionnaire" approach.

A directed questionnaire is one in which the researcher reads and interprets directions and items, and goes through each step with the respondent group. It has the advantage of both clarifying any doubts the respondent might have as to how the instrument is to be handled, and allowing for a greater degree of anonymity than the interview situation.

A pretest of the procedure was conducted at a community recreational facility in the sample area among youngsters who were ten to twelve years of age. No problems were manifest; therefore, it was decided that the directed questionnaire would be a legitimate instrument for the present research.

Having arrived at the technique and measuring instrument, the data were gathered from a Boys' Club in a north-central Kentucky city with a population of 55,000. The Boys' Club had been in existence for more than five years at the time of the study, and claimed a membership of 460 active members. A survey of attendance records for the six months prior to the time of the research showed an average daily attendance of over 150.

The Boys' Club was located in a building which had once served as a neighborhood church. The building stood on the periphery of the commercial "downtown" area of the city, adjacent to a lower-class black residential area. It was from this twenty block area that a preponderance of the Boys' Club membership was drawn. The staff of the Boys' Club consisted of a full-time Executive Director, a part-time Program Director, a part-time Athletic Director, and a varying number of volunteer workers.⁹

Since the Boys' Club membership was drawn from a largely homogeneous neighborhood, it was felt that certain important variables were automatically controlled for. The area

⁹Due to the physical limitations of the building itself, combined with a lack of staffing and proper equipment, the Boys' Club was incapable of adequately serving more than 30-40 boys at any particular time.

was characterized on the city's crime map as a high crime and delinquency area. The youngsters in the sample were black lower-class, eliminating the need to control for class and ethnic background.

The respondents in the present study were all those boys present on the days of the administration of the research instrument. The questionnaire was passed out without advance notice on four different days within a two week period in April of 1971. The respondents' ages ranged from ten through eighteen. The mean age was 14.8. No names were asked for and the respondents were assured that no authority would see the answers. After completion of the questionnaire the respondents dropped them in a sealed box which was handled by the researcher personally. This procedure reassured the respondents of the anonymity of their responses. The total number responding to the questionnaire was sixty-five. Of these, four were excluded because their questionnaires were incomplete, leaving a total of sixty-one used in the analysis.

It had originally been intended to select one day at random and allow the individuals in the Boys' Club on that day of administration to constitute the total sample. This would have precluded the possibility that the youngsters

would discuss the questionnaire and their answers with boys who had not yet been questioned. This proved unfeasible, however, due to the attendance of only fifteen to twenty boys each day.¹⁰

Approximately twenty hours were spent in the Boys' Club gathering the data. No significant problems were encountered, as the researcher had previously been employed as Athletic Director at the Boys' Club and was known and trusted by most of the boys present. In addition to the fact that the researcher's presence was taken for granted, the researcher was also able to effectively guide the respondents through any semantic problems encountered in the questionnaire.

¹⁰The disparity between the recorded attendance figures and the actual number of boys in attendance on the days of the administration of the questionnaire was resolved when a check of record-keeping practices indicated that each time a boy departed and subsequently re-entered the building he was counted as a new admission. Therefore, a small number of boys, leaving and re-entering the building at random, could grossly inflate the attendance figures.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data in the present study were obtained from sixty-one responses to a directed questionnaire which contained the seven item Nye-Short delinquency scale and a twelve item personal profile. Three by three tables were constructed, and the data were subjected to chi square tests in an attempt to ascertain significant relationships between various aspects of Boys' Club membership and participation and reported delinquent behavior scores. A total of fifty tests of significance were run on the data.

Generally, the respondents reported engaging in minimal amounts of delinquent activity. Forty-five of the sixty-one respondents received delinquency scores of less than five both before and after joining the Boys' Club. Although the Boys' Club was considered to serve a high delinquency area, only sixteen individuals could be placed in the "high" delinquency category either prior to or subsequent to joining the Boys' Club.

SAMPLE PROFILE

Although book membership of the Boys' Club indicated a substantial number of white members, all the respondents in the present study were black.¹ With regard to age, eleven of the total sample were boys aged 10-12, twenty-two of the respondents were aged 13-15 and twenty-eight of the youngsters were aged 16-18. The mean age of the subjects was 14.8. It should be noted that this is the approximate median age for juvenile delinquency.

Concerning the spatial distribution of the respondents within the demographic area, twenty-eight of the youngsters indicated that they lived on the street where the Boys' Club was located. Ten individuals listed a second lower-class area approximately five blocks from the Boys' Club. Nine boys gave their residence as a federally subsidized, low cost housing development located approximately twelve blocks from the Boys' Club. Thirteen of the respondents indicated that they lived in areas which were elsewhere on the side of town on which the Boys' Club was located, while one individual stated that he resided on the opposite side of town.

¹A check of the records indicated that white youngsters had actively participated in Boys' Club activities for a short while after the organization of the Club. However, white participation steadily declined after the first few months until, at the time of the study, there were no white individuals who were regular attenders.

The majority of the respondents (32) reported that they lived with the mother only. Nine youngsters indicated that they lived with their father, while sixteen individuals lived in physically unbroken homes. Three boys reported that they lived with relatives other than the mother or father, and one youngster lived with people to whom he was not related.

FINDINGS

All the independent variables (age, length of membership, average weekly attendance, activities, friendship, and prior delinquency score) were tabulated and tests of significance were run to determine their relationship to the amount of delinquent activity reported after joining the Boys' Club. In addition, five personal profile items relating to home life were introduced as intervening variables.

As a further refinement of the data, a three by four table was constructed for each item of the Nye-Short delinquency scale. These tables indicate the percentage distribution and frequency of commission of each offense by age and before and after joining the Boys' Club (see appendix).

Age and Delinquent Behavior

It was predicted that there would be a positive relationship between age and frequency of delinquent activity to

age sixteen. Although not significant at the .05 per cent level, the data illustrated by Table 1 indicate a tendency in the predicted direction. When the two higher delinquency categories were combined for each age group, it was found that five youngsters (slightly less than one-half) in the 10-12 age group reported scores which placed them in the higher categories. Over one-half of the respondents aged 13-15 were placed in the two upper categories, while slightly more than two-thirds of the individuals aged 16-18 were similarly placed.

The expectation that a slight decrease in delinquent behavior after age sixteen would be observed is more clearly illustrated in Table 5. One-half of the twelve boys aged 16-18 who received prior scores placing them in the most delinquent category reported a subsequent decrease in delinquent activity.

Delinquent Activity Before and After Joining The Boys' Club

As Table 2 indicates, the amount of delinquent activity a respondent reports having engaged in prior to joining the Boys' Club largely determines the amount he will report subsequent to joining. This resulted in an effort to determine which respondents reported increased delinquent activity, and which reported decreased delinquent activity

Table 1

Delinquency Category After Joining Boys' Club, By Age Grouping

After Delinquency Category	10-12		13-15		16-18	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1 (low)	6	54.5	10	45.5	9	32.1
2 (int.)	2	18.2	6	27.3	12	42.9
3 (high)	3	27.3	6	27.3	7	25.0
N = 61	11	100%	22	100%	28	100%

Chi Square = 3.4

df = 4

P < .50

Table 2

Delinquency Category of Respondents Before and After Joining Boys' Club

After Delinquency Category	Before Delinquency Category					
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
	1 (low)		2 (int.)		3 (high)	
1 (low)	16	80.0	7	28.0	2	12.5
2 (int.)	2	10.0	12	48.0	6	37.5
3 (high)	2	10.0	6	24.0	8	50.0
N = 61	20	100%	25	100%	16	100%
Chi Square = 22.47 df = 4						
P < .001						

after joining the Boys' Club. Age was held constant for the same variables shown in Table 2. All the youngsters who possessed a delinquency score placing them in the lowest category before joining the Boys' Club, and who subsequently moved into the higher categories, were aged thirteen and over. Four of the six respondents who reported an increase from the intermediate delinquency category to the high delinquency category were located in the 13-15 age range; the remaining two were aged 10-12. The most significant decrease in delinquent activity was observed among the juveniles aged sixteen and over; of the eight respondents who reported a decrease from the high category subsequent to joining, six were in this age grouping. It should be noted, however, that only one of the 16-18 year olds scored low enough to be placed in the least delinquent category (see tables 3, 4, and 5). As indicated in the above discussion, increases and declines in delinquent activity might well be a function of age rather than the fact that the respondents belonged to the Boys' Club.

Friendship and Delinquent Activity

An underlying assumption of the hypothesis of this study is that identification with the peer group which composes the membership of the Boys' Club will serve to channel the

Table 3

Delinquency Categories For Boys' Aged 10-12

After Delinquency Category	Before Delinquency Category		
	1 (low) Number	2 (int.) Number	3 (high) Number
1 (low)	4	2	0
2 (int.)	0	2	0
3 (high)	0	2	1
N = 11	4	6	1

Table 4

Delinquency Categories For Boys Aged 13-15

After Delinquency Category	Before Delinquency Category		
	1 (low) Number	2 (int.) Number	3 (high) Number
1 (low)	6	3	1
2 (int.)	1	4	1
3 (high)	1	4	1
N = 22	8	11	3

Table 5

Delinquency Categories For Boys Aged 16-18

After Delinquency Category	Before Delinquency Category		
	1 (low)	2 (int.)	3 (high)
1 (low)	6	2	1
2 (int.)	1	6	5
3 (high)	1	0	6
N = 28	8	8	12

activities of the youngster in directions that are acceptable to the group, namely delinquent activities. It was expected that individuals who were least delinquent prior to joining, but who identified strongly with the membership, would report an increase in delinquent activity subsequent to joining. A further consideration was the possibility that an individual who was considered "too bad" might be subjected to pressures to modify his behavior, thereby becoming less delinquent.² Table 6 illustrates the relationship between friendship identification and delinquency scores. It was found that seven of the eleven youngsters who reported having few friends in the Boys' Club were in the lowest delinquency category. Of the fifty respondents who reported that most or all of their best friends belonged to the Boys' Club, only nineteen placed in the low category after joining.

As tables 7, 8, and 9 illustrate, those individuals who have few best friends among the Boys' Club membership are the ones least likely to report an increase in delinquent activity after joining the Boys' Club. Of the respondents who reported that most of their best friends were Boys' Club members, six reported an increase in delinquent activity, four reported a decrease, while fifteen remained in the same

²Thomas Kochman, "'Rapping' in the Black Ghetto," Trans Action, vol. 6 (February, 1969), pp. 26-34.

Table 6

Delinquency Category After Joining The Boys' Club, By Friendship

After Delinquency Category	Few Best Friends		Most Best Friends		All Best Friends	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1 (low)	7	63.6	10	38.5	9	37.5
2 (int.)	1	9.1	7	26.9	11	45.8
3 (high)	3	27.3	9	34.6	4	16.7
N = 61	11	100%	26	100%	24	100%

Chi Square = 10.49 df = 4

P < .05

Table 7

Friendship Within The Club (Prior Score of 1)

After Delinquency Category	Few Best Friends	Most Best Friends	All Best Friends
	Number	Number	Number
1 (low)	5	6	6
2 (int.)	0	0	2
3 (high)	0	1	1
N = 20	5	7	9

Table 8

Friendship Within The Club (Prior Score of 2)

After Delinquency Category	Few Best Friends	Most Best Friends	All Best Friends
	Number	Number	Number
1 (low)	3	4	1
2 (int.)	0	6	5
3 (high)	1	5	0
N = 25	3	15	6

Table 9

Friendship Within The Club (Prior Score of 3)

After Delinquency Category	Few Best Friends	Most Best Friends	All Best Friends
	Number	Number	Number
1 (low)	0	0	2
2 (int.)	1	1	4
3 (high)	2	3	3
N = 16	3	4	9

category both before and after joining. It was further revealed that there was a tendency among those individuals who reported all their best friends as belonging to the Boys' Club to gravitate toward the intermediate delinquency category subsequent to joining.

Length Of Membership And Increased Social Participation

It was expected that duration and intensity of participation as a Boys' Club member would have a positive relationship to increased delinquent activity. The types of activities one might engage in were categorized as random (just hanging around talking to the guys, etc.), spontaneous (pick-up basketball, impromptu pool and checker tournaments), and organized (clubs and other programs of long duration which were supervised by the staff). As tables 10 and 11 indicate, length of membership and type of activities engaged in are only nebulously related to the scores the respondents reported after joining the Boys' Club. As a further check on the data, activities and length of membership were held constant, and prior and subsequent scores were compared. This effort also failed to reveal relationships significant at the .05 per cent level.

In an attempt to ascertain the impact of regular attendance upon delinquent activity, a test was run comparing

Table 10

Length of Membership by Delinquency Category

After Delinquency Category	1-2 Years		3-4 Years		5-6 Years	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1 (low)	6	42.9	11	35.5	8	50.0
2 (int.)	5	35.7	12	38.7	3	18.8
3 (high)	3	21.4	8	25.8	5	31.3
N = 61	14	100%	31	100%	16	100%

Chi Square = 2.58 df = 4

P > .50

Table 11

Activities Engaged in by Delinquency Category

After Delinquency Category	Random		Spontaneous		Organized	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1 (low)	12	46.2	10	40.0	3	30.0
2 (int.)	8	30.8	9	36.0	3	30.0
3 (high)	6	23.1	6	24.0	4	40.0
N = 61	26	100%	25	100%	10	100%

Chi Square = 1.78 df = 4

P > .70

prior scores and subsequent scores by amount of attendance. Although, as expected, the amount of delinquent activity the respondents reported committing prior to joining the Boys' Club was not affected by the regularity of attendance, the average weekly attendance did bear a significant relationship to delinquency scores subsequent to joining the Boys' Club (see Table 12). Again, there is observed a definite tendency to gravitate toward the intermediate delinquency category for those who are regular members.

SUMMARY

The prediction that there would be a positive relationship between age and frequency of reported delinquent activity up to age sixteen, with a concomitant decline thereafter, was supported by the data in the present study. The expectation that there would be a decrease in delinquent activity after age sixteen was most clearly observed for those individuals who had formerly been in the most delinquent category.

The hypothesis that there would be an increase in delinquent activity after joining the Boys' Club for those who were previously least delinquent, combined with a possible decrease for those youngsters who were previously most delinquent, but who might be expected to face group pres-

Table 12

Average Weekly Attendance by Delinquency Category

After Delinquency Category	Less Than Once		Once Or Twice		Three Times Or More	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1 (low)	5	45.5	8	57.1	12	33.3
2 (int.)	1	9.0	2	14.3	17	47.2
3 (high)	5	45.5	4	28.6	7	19.4
N = 61	11	100%	14	100%	36	100%

Chi Square = 9.71 df = 4

P < .05

asures not to be "too bad", was partially supported by the findings. Although there was no change in prior and subsequent delinquency categories for the majority of the respondents, when the age and friendship variables were taken into consideration, the pattern that emerges clearly indicates a direct relationship between age and increased delinquent activity, and between friendship identification and delinquent activity.

There was no support for the hypothesis that length of membership would have a positive relationship to frequency of reported delinquent acts. However, when the variable of regular attendance was introduced, it lent support to the hypothesis that increased participation would have a direct relationship to increased delinquent activity.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study empirically tested the responses of sixty-one Boys' Club members to a questionnaire which contained the Nye-Short delinquency scale. Frequency of self-reported delinquent activity was compared for the youngsters both before and after having joined the Boys' Club in an effort to ascertain what impact, if any, Boys' Club membership had had upon their delinquent behavior.

The principal findings indicate that the various aspects of Boys' Club membership and participation had minimal effect upon the members' self-reported delinquent actions. However, when other variables such as age and friendship identification were taken into consideration, positive relationships to an increase or decrease in delinquent activity were seen to emerge. It is now necessary to fit the findings into a sociological frame of reference which can be utilized in explaining the phenomenon under consideration.

Perhaps the first consideration in discussing research pertaining to the incidence of delinquency is one of definition. It seems that most students of delinquency fre-

quently over-lap and confuse the rational tradition of the culture as it bears upon aberrant actions and the programmatic constructs of the legal system as they bear upon operationally defined offenses. To extract the legalistic constructs from the phenomenon being studied and to utilize them as the canon for the study of that phenomenon might be considered self-defeating, since the researcher is relying upon presupposed qualities of delinquency. In doing this, he puts himself in the position of being in collusion with that which he is attempting to study.

It may therefore be considered that any scheme for discovering the meaning of delinquency and the terms and designations upon which it rests would involve discounting the author of the technical scheme (the judico-legal system) under which the phenomenon is subsumed as being an authority on the meaning of the terms and concepts it uses. The obvious meaning of the terms would be ignored, and emphasis would be placed upon determining how the scheme is brought to bear upon whatever falls within its constellation.

Abstracted to custom as well as to codification, it could be argued that a particular act would be considered deviant (or delinquent) only insofar as it was defined as such by the group upon which it had particular and direct

consequence. In this situation, many acts which are defined as delinquent by one segment of the culture may be interpreted as such only from the particular moralistic bias of that segment of the culture. Perhaps it would be more fruitful to analyze the impact a particular act has upon that segment of the culture upon which it impinges in arriving at a definition of what is "delinquent." It is suggested, therefore, that any instrument which depends in whole or in part upon the technical scheme as a reference in bringing scrutiny to bear upon "delinquency" has inherent limitations for bringing one closer to the etiology of delinquent activity.

A second consideration pertains to the concept of social functioning as it relates to the Boys' Club as a behavior shaping organizational unit. Among other definitions of function, Merton sees social function as activities assigned to the incumbent of a social status (individual social functioning), and functions as social procedures which help maintain the system (organizational social functioning).¹

In discussing social functioning on the individual level, we are concerned with the internalization of status

¹Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1964), p. 49.

roles which guide relationships between actors and which are in turn governed by normative beliefs. Znaniecki considered social role to be a complex of values relating the person performing the role ("social person") to other beneficiaries of this performance ("the social circle").² In terms of the social circle, the actor is expected to display the kind of qualities the social circle needs. Insofar as he adequately performs his given role, he possesses status within the particular reference system of the social circle.

Organizational social functioning occurs when a given unit has a definite responsibility to accomplish certain goals assigned to it by the system of which it is a part, as well as by other systems within the community. The unit, in order to function successfully, must be goal directed, with role performances which are integrated, more or less routinized, and compatible with the stated mission of the organizational unit.

In respect to the Boys' Club, we are dealing with an organizational unit which has as its stated goal the alteration of the delinquent behavior patterns of boys whose social circles recognize and subscribe to the subculture of

²Florian Znaniecki, The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge (New York University Press, 1940).

delinquency. To the extent to which it is successful in accomplishing its stated mission, the organizational unit may be said to have fulfilled its manifest function as dictated by the larger community.

It was considered that in order to perform its manifest function effectively it would be necessary for the Boys' Club unit to attract and maintain contact with those boys in the target population, who were most delinquent. However, as has been shown in the data chapter, the unit regularly served only a small fraction of the juvenile boys who inhabited the area. In addition, a process of selection seems to have occurred to the point that the respondents in the present study were those individuals who had engaged in minimal delinquent activity both before and after having joined the Boys' Club. This finding is in line with Ellery Reed's conclusion that group work agencies habitually serve youngsters who are less likely to become delinquent. The implication here is that the Boys' Club in question has acted as a sort of social sieve to select out and exclude those individuals who, for one reason or another, were not compatible with the norms and values reflected by the group composed of the integral members of the Boys' Club.

The work of Muzafer and Carolyn Sherif provides further

elaboration upon a phenomenon recognized by students from Hollingshead to Merton and which helps to explain further the inferred "exclusivity" of the unit in this study; the phenomenon of "clique" or "gang" formation.³ The Sherifs maintain that when there is regularity in the give and take among members, which continues over an extended period of time, roles are differentiated; power-status relationships develop, and group structure emerges. The clique (or gang) places a value upon survival, which leads it to screen prospective members and exclude those individuals who display qualities considered to be undesirable by group standards. It could be argued that once a clique has formed, and has accommodated itself to the formal structure of the Boys' Club, the question of which individuals become regular, participating members within the unit is left more to the discretion of the clique membership than to the directors of the Boys' Club.

The findings generally supported the assumption that increased age would be positively associated with increased delinquent activity to age sixteen, with a subsequent de-

³Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn Sherif, "Group Processes and Collective Interaction in Delinquent Activities," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, vol. 4, no. 1, Jan. 1967, pp. 43-62.

crease thereafter. Explanations for this observation can be found in the fact that as youngsters reach adolescence they begin to seek extra-familial interaction settings to meet felt needs not met in the family context. As Hollingshead has pointed out, they become increasingly attracted to peer positions and transfer much of their loyalty from the family to the peer group.⁴ This peer group, in the formulations of Matza, occupies that area of the social structure where control has been loosened, but where adolescent endeavor has failed to fashion a coherent, autonomous subculture. Therefore, the youngster drifts between the demands of convention and delinquency, responding first to the one, then to the other. As juveniles mature, however, and the time for entering the adult world approaches, anticipatory socialization becomes operational to the extent that most individuals begin to conform more nearly to the norms of the dominant culture.

It was expected that duration of Boys' Club membership, combined with increased participation in random and spontaneous activities would have a positive relationship to increased delinquent behavior. However, the findings indi-

⁴August B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth, (New York: Wiley, 1949).

cated that length of membership and type of activities engaged in were not significantly related to increased delinquent behavior. There are two factors which should be taken into consideration here. The first consideration deals with the length of time necessary to socialize the individual into the Boys' Club setting. It was expected that the Boys' Club would confront the new member with a formal, coherent organizational structure which he would come to articulate over an extended period of time as the process of socialization continued. Within this formal structure an informal structure would emerge which would at times be in opposition to the formal structure and which would compete for the individual's loyalty. However, unlike "boot camp" or other total institutions, the Boys' Club seems to have presented a rather benign formal structure to which the individual was able to adapt rather quickly. The second factor in this explanation concerns the before mentioned clique formation and exclusivity. As the data indicate, fifty of the sixty-one respondents reported that most or all of their best friends were Boys' Club members. It could be reasoned therefore, that the Boys' Club membership consisted of those individuals who were already members of a homogeneous segment of the juvenile subculture of the community and that the club

unit merely provided a locus for an ongoing informal structure within which little or no resocialization was required.

DISCUSSION

It must be concluded that the Boys' Club in the present study was not an important factor in the prevention of delinquent behavior as measured by the Nye-Short delinquency scale. In view of the findings of this study, as well as the findings of Thrasher, it seems that any appeal for funding based upon the claim that Boys' Clubs "prevent" juvenile delinquency would be unwarranted. However, it should be emphasized that any conclusions drawn from the present study should not be applied to other Boys' Clubs except insofar as conditions are parallel.

Perhaps what is needed is a re-evaluation of the idea that any agency can "prevent" delinquency. As most delinquency theories indicate, we have persisted in viewing delinquent behavior compartmentally, as somehow being alien to, and existing outside, the social structure. Therefore, we look for all or nothing solutions to the problem of delinquent activity. Very little time and effort is spent in seeking ways to manipulate delinquency producing situations, not in an effort to eradicate delinquency, but in an effort to control and perhaps deter certain delinquent acts. In

the following paragraphs we shall discuss some means by which the club unit in the present study may come to have a more significant impact upon the delinquency picture in its target area.

It was found that the Boys' Club did not successfully attract and hold a significant proportion of the individuals in the area it was intended to serve. Perhaps one reason for this failure was the fact that physical facilities were totally inadequate. The addition of such facilities as a swimming pool, a full sized gymnasium, and adequate space for club meetings would provide the attraction for boys of diverse interests.

Once the initial attraction was accomplished, it would become necessary to combat the formation of a dominant clique in order to prevent the forcing out or drifting away of peripheral members. A study of the felt needs of the boys in the community is indicated, with the resultant recruitment of stable volunteer workers who have expertise in areas of diverse interest. This would do much to prevent the formation of a monolithic informal structure within the club setting.

An increased summer program would do much to fill the leisure time of youngsters on school vacation. The records

indicate that the summer months were characterized by decreased regular attendance, perhaps due to the lack of any comprehensive summer program other than the camping program. The camping program, however, was only designed to accommodate twenty boys for each two week period.

A more accurate method of record keeping should be devised to reflect the attendance patterns of both integral and nominal members. As much background information as possible should be obtained for each member as well as for each non-member in the Boys' Club area. This could possibly be done by working with the local school system as well as with the juvenile court and other social welfare agencies. In addition, follow up studies should be conducted on Boys' Club dropouts in an effort to ascertain why they left the club unit. These record keeping practices would aid Boys' Club officials to evaluate more effectively the types of youngsters reached by certain programs, to evaluate the effectiveness of new programs, and to provide indications of requirements necessary to attract additional members.

Consideration should be given to the utilization of professionally trained staff whenever possible. In addition to trained Boys' Club directors, perhaps such members of the local community as psychologists and guidance counselors

could be recruited on a volunteer basis. The utilization of exemplars from the target area could prove useful in providing marginally delinquent boys with a reference model which would channel their behavior in socially acceptable directions. If we accept Matza's formulations, a large proportion of delinquency is marginal. Therefore, the use of exemplars would be very effective in effecting a modification of delinquent behavior patterns among the membership of juvenile groups.

Finally, and perhaps most important, the Boys' Club should redefine its role in the community. Instead of stressing its function as a delinquency prevention mechanism, with the concomitant implicit labelling of Boys' Club members as potential delinquents, the Boys' Club should emphasize the fact that it does provide socially desirable services to many youngsters who would otherwise not receive them. In addition, the directorship could delineate certain problem areas in which the club unit could function as an intervening agent to bring about desired changes. Perhaps the result would not be the out and out prevention of delinquency, but could at least be a move toward a modification of the delinquency picture in its area of service.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A:
THE BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akers, Ronald L. "Socioeconomic Status and Delinquent Behavior: A Retest," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 1 (Jan., 1964), pp. 38-46.
- Becker, Howard S. Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. New York: The Free Press, 1963.
- Blake, Judith, and Kingsley Davis. "Norms, Values, and Sanctions," in Robert E. L. Faris, ed., Handbook of Modern Sociology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.
- Boys' Clubs of America. Program Evaluation in a Boys' Club. A Report Prepared by Boys' Clubs of America. New York: Boys' Clubs of America, 1967.
- Braunstein, Zola. "Boys' Club Membership Mortality and Turnover," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 6 (Sept., 1932), pp. 59-63.
- Briar, Scott, and Irving Piliavin. "Delinquency, Situational Inducements, and Commitments to Conformity," Social Problems, Vol. 13 (Summer, 1965), pp. 35-45.
- Brown, Roscoe, and Dan Dodson. "The Effectiveness of a Boys' Club in Reducing Delinquency," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, No. 322 (Mar., 1959), pp. 47-52.
- Cavan, Ruth (ed.) Readings in Juvenile Delinquency. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1964.
- Cloward, Richard, and Lloyd Ohlin. Delinquency and Opportunity. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960.
- Cohen, Albert K. Delinquent Boys. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

- Dentler, Robert A., and Lawrence J. Monroe. "Social Correlates of Early Adolescent Theft," American Sociological Review, Vol. 26 (Oct., 1961), pp. 733-743.
- Dentler, Robert A., and Lawrence J. Monroe. "The Family and Early Adolescent Conformity and Deviance," Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 23 (Aug., 1961), pp. 241-247.
- Elkin, Frederick, and William A. Westley. "The Myth of Adolescent Culture," American Sociological Review, Vol. 20 (Dec., 1955), pp. 680-684.
- Erickson, M. L. and L. T. Empey. "Court Records, Undetected Delinquency, and Decision Making," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol 54 (Dec., 1963), pp. 456-469.
- Fisk, Margaret (ed.) Encyclopedia of Associations. Detroit: Gale Research Company Book Tower, Vol. 1, 1970.
- Ford Foundation. The Society of the Streets. A Report Prepared by the Ford Foundation. New York: The Ford Foundation, 1962, p. 10.
- Gandy, John M. "Preventive Work With Street Corner Groups: Hyde Park Youth Project," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, No. 322 (1959), 107-116.
- Gold, Martin. "Undetected Delinquent Behavior," The Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency, (Jan., 1966), pp. 27-46.
- Hollingshead, August B. Elmtown's Youth. New York: John Wiley, 1949.
- Hood, Roger, and Richard Sparks. Key Issues in Criminology. New York: World University Library, 1970.
- Kochman, Thomas. "'Rapping' in the Black Ghetto," Trans Action, Vol. 6 (Feb., 1969), pp. 26-34.
- Kraus, Richard. "Delinquency and Recreation: Fact and Fiction," Recreation, (Oct., 1965), pp. 382-385.

- Matza, David. Delinquency and Drift. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1964.
- Miller, Walter B. "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 14, No. 3 (1958), pp. 5-19.
- Miller, Walter B. "Preventive Work With Street Corner Groups: Boston Delinquency Project," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, No. 322 (1959), pp. 97-106.
- Murphy, Fred J., Mary M. Shirley, and Helen L. Witmer. "The Incidence of Hidden Delinquency," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 16 (Summer, 1946), pp. 686-696.
- Nelson, Janet Fowler. "The Statistical Aspects of the Boys' Club Study," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 6 (Sept., 1932), pp. 31-42.
- Nye, F. Ivan, and James F. Short, Jr. "Scaling Delinquent Behavior," American Sociological Review, Vol. 22 (June, 1957), pp. 326-331.
- Nye, F. Ivan, James F. Short, Jr., and Virgil J. Olsen. "Socioeconomic Status and Delinquent Behavior," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 63 (June, 1958), pp. 381-388.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. New York: Free Press, 1951.
- Porterfield, Austin L. "Delinquency and Its Outcome in Court and College," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 49 (Nov., 1943), pp. 199-208.
- Reed, Ellery F. "How Effective Are Group-Work Agencies in Preventing Delinquency?" The Social Service Review, Vol. 22 (Fall, 1948), pp. 340-348.

- Reiss, Albert J., and Albert L. Rhodes. "The Distribution of Juvenile Delinquency in the Social Class Structure," American Sociological Review, Vol. 26 (Oct., 1961), pp. 720-732.
- Robison, Sophia. "Why Juvenile Delinquency Preventive Programs are Ineffective," Federal Probation, Vol. 25 (Dec., 1961), pp. 27-35.
- Sanders, Wiley B. Juvenile Offenders for a Thousand Years. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1970.
- Sherif, Muzafer, and Carolyn Sherif. "Group Processes and Collective Interaction in Delinquent Activities," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 4 (Jan., 1967), pp. 5-17.
- Sherif, Muzafer, and Carolyn Sherif. Reference Groups: Exploration into Conformity and Deviation of Adolescents. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- Sutherland, Edwin H., and Donald Cressey. Principles of Criminology, 8th ed. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1970.
- Thrasher, Frederic M. "Ecological Aspects of the Boys' Club Study," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 6 (Sept., 1932), pp. 4-16.
- Thrasher, Frederic M. "The Boys' Club and Juvenile Delinquency," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 42 (Winter, 1936), pp. 66-80.
- Thrasher, Frederic M. "The Boys' Club Study," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 6 (Sept., 1932), pp. 4-16.
- Thrasher, Frederic M. The Gang: A Study of 1,313 Gangs in Chicago. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927.
- U. S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Uniform Crime Reports. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Whitley, Robert L. "Case Studies in the Boys' Club Study,"
Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 6 (Sept., 1932),
pp. 17-30.

Yablonsky, Lewis. The Violent Gang. New York: Macmillan,
1963.

Znaniecki, Florian. The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge.
New York: New York University Press, 1940.

APPENDIX B:
THE QUESTIONNAIRE

This is an anonymous questionnaire. No attempt will be made to connect the answers to these questions with any individual. Please DO NOT put your name or initials on any part of the questionnaire. Please answer all questions as correctly as possible. Mark only one answer for each question. When you have finished drop the questionnaire in the sealed box provided for this purpose. Do not show anyone your answers.

1-5 serial number

6 sample

- ___ 7. What was your age at your last birthday?
1. 10-12
 2. 13-15
 3. 16-18
- ___ 8. How long have you been a member of the Boys' Club?
1. 5-6 years
 2. 3-4 years
 3. 1-2 years
- ___ 9. How many times per week, on the average, do you come to the Club?
1. Three times or more
 2. Once or twice each week
 3. Less than once a week
- ___ 10. What do you usually do when you come to the Club?
1. Take part in organized games and other activities such as clubs.

2. Take part in games which are not supervised by one of the directors, such as pick-up basketball, wrestling, etc.
 3. Just hang around talking to the guys.
- ___11. Do many of your friends belong to the Club?
1. All of my best friends
 2. Most of my best friends
 3. A few of my best friends
 4. None of my best friends

Everyone breaks some rules during his lifetime. Below are some rules frequently broken. Check those that you have broken BEFORE joining the Boys' Club.

- ___12. Driven a car without a driver's license or permit?
1. no
 2. once or twice
 3. several times
 4. very often
- ___13. Skipped school without a valid excuse?
1. no
 2. once or twice
 3. several times
 4. very often
- ___14. Ever disobeyed your parents?
1. no

2. once or twice
3. several times
4. very often

___15. Had a fist fight with one other person?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times
4. very often

___16. Ever told a lie?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times
4. very often

___17. Run away from home?

1. no
2. once
3. two times
4. three times
5. four times
6. five times
7. over five times

___18. Been placed on school probation or expelled from school?

1. no

2. once or twice
3. three or four times
4. five or six times
5. over six times

___19. Defied your parents to their face?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times
4. very often

___20. Driven too fast or recklessly in an automobile?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. very often
4. several times

___21. Taken little things worth less than \$2 that did not belong to you?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times
4. very often

___22. Taken things worth \$2 to \$50 that did not belong to you?

1. no
2. once or twice

3. several times

4. very often

___23. Taken things worth over \$50 that did not belong to you?

1. no

2. once or twice

3. several times

4. very often

___24. Taken things you really didn't want that did not belong to you?

1. no

2. once or twice

3. several times

4. very often

___25. Taken part in gang fights?

1. no

2. once or twice

3. three or four times

4. five or six times

5. over six times

___26. Taken a car for a ride without the owner's knowledge?

1. no

2. once

3. twice

4. three times
5. four times
6. five times
7. over five times

___27. Beat up on kids who hadn't done anything to you?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times
4. very often

___28. Bought or drank beer, wine, or liquor?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times
4. very often

___29. Hurt someone else just to see them squirm?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times
4. very often

___30. Purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times

4. very often

___31. Used or sold narcotic drugs?

1. no

2. once

3. twice

4. three times

5. four times

6. five times

7. over five times

___32. Had sex relations with a person of the opposite sex?

1. no

2. once or twice

3. three or four times

4. five or six times

5. seven or eight times

6. nine times or more

___33. Gone hunting or fishing without a license, or violated other game laws?

1. no

2. once or twice

3. several times

4. very often

As we grow older we continue to break rules and regulations. Some break them regularly, others less often. Check the rules you have broken SINCE joining the Boys' Club.

- ___34. Driven a car without a driver's license or permit?
1. no
 2. once or twice
 3. several times
 4. very often
- ___35. Skipped school without a valid excuse?
1. no
 2. once or twice
 3. several times
 4. very often
- ___36. Disobeyed your parents?
1. no
 2. once or twice
 3. several times
 4. very often
- ___37. Had a fist fight with one other person?
1. no
 2. once or twice
 3. several times
 4. very often

___38. Told a lie?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times
4. very often

___39. Run away from home?

1. no
2. once
3. twice
4. three times
5. four times
6. five times
7. over five times

___40. Been placed on school probation or expelled from school?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. three or four times
4. five or six times
5. over six times

___41. Defied your parents to their face?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times

- ___42. Driven too fast or recklessly in an automobile?
1. no
 2. once or twice
 3. several times
 4. very often
- ___43. Taken little things worth less than \$2 that did not belong to you?
1. no
 2. once or twice
 3. several times
 4. very often
- ___44. Taken things worth between \$2 and \$50 that did not belong to you?
1. no
 2. once or twice
 3. several times
 4. very often
- ___45. Taken things worth more than \$50?
1. no
 2. once or twice
 3. several times
 4. very often

___46. Taken things that you didn't really want that did not belong to you?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times
4. very often

___47. Taken part in gang fights?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. three or four times
4. five or six times
5. over six times

___48. Taken a car for a ride without the owner's knowledge?

1. no
2. once
3. twice
4. three times
5. four times
6. five times
7. over five times

___49. Beat up on kids who hadn't done anything to you?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times

4. very often

___50. Bought or drank beer, wine, or liquor?

1. no

2. once or twice

3. several times

4. very often

___51. Hurt someone else just to see them squirm?

1. no

2. once or twice

3. several times

4. very often

___52. Purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you?

1. no

2. once or twice

3. several times

4. very often

___53. Used or sold narcotic drugs?

1. no

2. once

3. twice

4. three times

5. four times

6. five times
7. over five times

___54. Had sex relations with a person of the opposite sex?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. three or four times
4. five or six times
5. seven or eight times
6. nine times or more

___55. Gone ~~hunting~~ or fishing without a license, or violated other game laws?

1. no
2. once or twice
3. several times
4. very often

___56. When you have broken rules and regulations since joining the Club, were you usually

1. by yourself
2. with other Club members
3. with guys who are not Club members
4. about equally by yourself and other Club members
5. about equally by yourself and non-Club members
6. about equally by yourself, other Club members, and non-Club members
7. about equally with Club members and non-Club members

___57. With whom do you live?

1. father
2. mother
3. both father and mother
4. other relatives
5. someone who is not related to you

___58. Do your parents (or guardians) quarrel or argue?

1. no
2. seldom
3. sometimes
4. often
5. very often

___59. With whom did you live before joining the Boys' Club?

1. father
2. mother
3. both father and mother
4. other relatives
5. someone who is not related to you

___60. Are you scolded or nagged when you are at home?

1. no
2. not very often
3. most of the time
4. all of the time

___61. What part of town do you live in?

1. Five Street
2. Mechanicsville
3. Ninth Street
4. Elsewhere in the West End
5. Rolling Heights Project
6. Elsewhere in the East End

___62. Do you enjoy being at home with your mother / father?

1. no
2. a little
3. somewhat
4. very much

63-64 before score

65-66 before scale

67-68 after score

69-70 after scale

APPENDIX C:

TABLES

Table 13

Percentage Distribution and Frequency of Scale Item
 "Driven a Car Without a Driver's License or Permit"

	10-12				13-15				16-18			
	Before		After		Before		After		Before		After	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	11	100	8	72.7	14	63.6	13	59.1	11	39.3	12	42.9
Once or twice	0	0	2	18.2	7	31.8	6	27.3	7	25.0	8	28.6
Several times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.6	7	25.0	5	17.8
Very often	0	0	1	9.1	1	4.6	2	9.0	3	10.7	3	10.7

Table 14

Percentage Distribution and Frequency of Scale Item
 "Skipped School Without a Valid Excuse"

	10-12				13-15				16-18			
	Before		After		Before		After		Before		After	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	8	72.7	9	81.8	11	50.0	10	45.5	9	32.2	10	35.7
Once or twice	2	18.2	1	9.1	5	22.8	6	27.3	11	39.3	11	39.3
Several times	1	9.1	1	9.1	4	18.2	4	18.2	3	10.7	6	21.4
Very often	0	0	0	0	2	9.0	2	9.0	5	17.8	1	3.6

Table 15

Percentage Distribution and Frequency of Scale Item "Defied Your Parents to Their Face"

	10-12				13-15				16-18			
	Before		After		Before		After		Before		After	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	7	63.6	6	54.5	14	63.6	16	72.6	20	71.4	16	57.1
Once or twice	1	9.1	2	18.2	7	31.8	5	22.8	5	17.8	8	28.6
Several times	3	27.3	2	18.2	0	0	0	0	2	7.2	3	10.7
Very often	0	0	1	9.1	1	4.6	1	4.6	1	3.6	1	3.6

Table 16
 Percentage Distribution and Frequency of Scale Item
 "Taken Things Worth Less Than \$2 That Didn't Belong to You"

	10-12				13-15				16-18			
	Before		After		Before		After		Before		After	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	5	45.4	5	45.4	11	50.0	9	40.9	12	42.9	13	46.4
Once or twice	3	27.3	6	54.6	7	31.8	9	40.9	10	35.7	9	32.2
Several times	2	18.2	0	0	2	9.1	3	13.6	4	14.2	5	17.8
Very often	1	9.1	0	0	2	9.1	1	4.6	2	7.2	1	3.6

Table 17

Percentage Distribution and Frequency of Scale Item
 "Bought or Drank Beer, Wine, or Liquor"

	10-12				13-15				16-18			
	Before		After		Before		After		Before		After	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	1	9.1	5	45.4	9	40.9	8	36.4	6	21.4	5	17.8
Once or twice	4	36.3	1	9.2	6	27.3	8	36.4	9	32.2	16	57.2
Several times	6	54.6	5	45.4	5	22.8	6	27.2	8	28.6	4	14.3
Very often	0	0	0	0	2	9.0	0	0	5	17.8	3	10.7

Table 18

Percentage Distribution and Frequency of Scale Item
 "Purposely Damaged or Destroyed Property of Other's"

	10-12				13-15				16-18			
	Before		After		Before		After		Before		After	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	4	36.3	3	27.3	13	59.1	16	72.6	10	35.7	17	60.6
Once or twice	5	45.3	6	54.5	8	36.4	3	13.6	13	46.4	8	28.6
Several times	1	9.2	0	0	0	0	1	4.6	3	10.7	1	3.6
Very often	1	9.2	2	18.2	1	4.5	2	9.2	2	7.2	2	7.2

Table 19

Percentage Distribution and Frequency of Scale Item
 "Had Sex Relations With a Person of the Opposite Sex"

	10-12				13-15				16-18			
	Before		After		Before		After		Before		After	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No	4	36.3	6	54.4	5	22.8	5	22.8	4	14.2	4	14.2
Once or twice	5	45.3	2	18.2	2	9.0	2	9.0	6	21.4	6	21.4
Several times	1	9.2	2	18.2	8	36.4	8	36.4	6	21.4	6	21.4
Very often	1	9.2	1	9.2	7	31.8	7	31.8	12	43.0	12	43.0